

April 5, 1965

finest and most successful examples of partnership between the Federal Government and the local people.

It also will mean that these technical services will no longer be available to the farmers who can't afford to pay for them. And it is likely that even the well-off farmers will be willing to pay only for assistance that means something in terms of a dollars-and-cents return. The bill for services will force most to pass up those practices that create wildlife habitat or otherwise conserve and beautify the countryside.

This budget cut would be a long step backward in our much talked about conservation program.

# PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND INABILITY

Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. President, I received from Mr. C. W. Ufford, director of industrial relations, of the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, an interesting and thought-provoking letter regarding the proposed constitutional amendment on presidential succession and inability.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ufford's letter be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WARNER & SWASEY CO.,  
Cleveland, Ohio, March 16, 1965.

The Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: The Senate's action in approving a proposed constitutional amendment on presidential succession and inability is to be warmly commended. The proposed amendment would be an important improvement over the present situation. However, I am concerned about two aspects of the proposal and I am sure many people would be if they probed into it.

The first is the provision for handling the resumption of office by the President. As now drafted, this would make it possible, for a period of time, for two people to attempt to exercise the powers and duties of the Presidency. This seems possible under the provision that the Vice President, with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet (or such other body as Congress may establish) will have 7 days in which to declare in writing that the President is unable to resume his office. The Congress would then proceed to decide the issue, a two-thirds vote being required in each House to sustain the Vice President and Cabinet in their finding of inability. The delay while Congress probed and debated the issue through its normal procedures in both Houses could make the determination of this difficult decision, especially in a time of crisis, a matter of critical importance.

My second concern is that this provision could, in effect, place in the hands of a hostile Congress actual impeachment power without the safeguard of proper impeachment procedure.

In view of these possibly serious flaws, may I commend to you an alternate provision recommended by the Committee for Economic Development which proposes that the ending of presidential inability be determined by a majority vote of the Cabinet, the President concurring. Discussions leading to such vote might be initiated by the President or any member of the Cabinet. The Cabinet is close to the President and his condition. It could act with a minimum of delay, publicity, and possible loss of public confidence.

I can think of no more compelling reason for this CED proposal, with which I presume you are already familiar, than that "there must always be a President, but there must never be two."

Again may I commend the Senate for moving ahead on this vital issue. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

C. W. UFFORD,  
Director of Industrial Relations.

## THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND HAWAII'S CONTRIBUTION

Mr. INOUE, Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, Hawaii's senior Senator, HIRAM L. FONG, and for myself, I am happy to take this opportunity again to invite all Senators to the special type A, pineapple lunch which Senator FONG and I are hosting in the Senate Conference Room, at 12:30 p.m., on Friday, April 9.

This lunch has a twofold purpose. The first is to remind each of us of the purpose, progress, and future importance of the national school lunch program. The second is to invite attention to the economic, as well as nutritional, contribution of Hawaii and our pineapple industry to the success of this program.

In 1946, Congress passed the National School Lunch Act. I believe that the high purpose of this landmark legislation is best described in the act itself. I quote:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs.

This policy statement is a very persuasive argument for the national school lunch program. Even more convincing, however, is the simple premise and slogan of the program itself: "You cannot teach a hungry child."

A child may hunger for knowledge; but if his very being hungers for food, learning is impeded—if not impossible. Clearly, a nutritious meal enhances a child's ability to learn; and a healthy, well-educated child enhances our Nation's future.

To me, the national school lunch program is a landmark of enlightened, yet self-serving, legislation. It has already given America a generation of healthier, better educated citizens; and it promises to enrich our Nation even more in the years ahead, for this program is growing—growing in size, growing in importance to the health of our economy, as well as our children.

Widely accepted today, the national school lunch program has not always enjoyed the approval and support of parents, educators, and legislators. In fact, it was only a few years ago that a prominent educator was able to say:

As an uninvited guest at the educational banquet, school food service has successfully run the gamut of neglect, of scorn, of

fear, of anger, and has now entered the approved portals which entitle it to a chair at the educational board.

In 1964, the national school lunch program occupied a dominant chair, indeed, at the educational board. During the 12 months which ended last June 30, for example, approximately 17 million schoolchildren—one-third of our pre-college school population—participated in the program daily. These children were served nearly 3 billion meals during the school year.

Not included in these figures as participants in the national school lunch program are an estimated 13 million children who also benefited from nutritious lunches served through other school-lunch programs.

The national school lunch program itself was actively supported by 68,500 schools in every State, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, in 1964. Both the number of children and the number of schools participating in the program are expected to increase this year.

Under the National School Lunch Act of 1946, all public and nonprofit private schools of high school grade or under are eligible to participate in the school lunch program. The fact that so many schools have elected to do so is due in large measure, I believe, to three regulations contained in the act.

First. The lunch program in each school must be operated on a nonprofit basis.

Second. Children unable to pay the full price of the lunch must be served free or at a reduced price.

Third. Lunches must meet nutritional standards established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These standards are embodied in the lunch pattern known as the type A lunch—the type of lunch, incidentally, which will be served on Friday, April 9.

How does the national school lunch program actually work?

The program is administered by the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the education departments of the various States. These departments enter into agreements with local boards of education. The local school authorities or other interested groups actually operate the school lunchrooms. Department of Agriculture specialists provide administrative and technical assistance to State personnel, who, in turn, make this assistance available to individual school managers.

Many States do not permit the educational agencies to administer the national school lunch program in nonprofit private schools. In these States, the schools may enter into agreements directly with the Department of Agriculture.

In the fiscal year 1964 the national school lunch program cost approximately \$1½ billion. Of this amount the school children themselves contributed approximately one-half—more than \$741 million, or an average of 25 to 30 cents for each lunch. Federal funds to reimburse

County	Man-years	Dollars
7th District:		
Adams.....	0.3	2,334
Clark.....	.9	6,790
Florence.....	.1	476
Forest.....	.1	456
Langlade.....	.5	3,266
Lincoln.....	.4	2,931
Marathon.....	1.6	11,784
Marquette.....	.5	3,280
Portage.....	.3	2,269
Shawano.....	.6	4,620
Taylor.....	.8	5,847
Waupaca.....	1.1	7,660
Waushara.....	.6	4,230
Wood.....	.9	6,685
Menominee.....	0	-----
8th District:		
Brown.....	.8	5,419
Dor.....	.2	1,775
Kewaunee.....	.7	5,169
Manitowoc.....	.9	6,628
Marquette.....	.3	2,679
Oconto.....	.6	4,023
Outagamie.....	1.0	7,172
9th District:		
Millwaukee.....	0	-----
Waukesha.....	.6	4,066
10th District:		
Ashland.....	.2	1,481
Barron.....	.2	5,106
Bayfield.....	.1	1,384
Burnett.....	.3	1,789
Chippewa.....	.7	5,017
Douglas.....	.3	2,111
Dunn.....	.6	3,963
Eau Claire.....	.5	3,669
Iron.....	.1	482
Oneida.....	.1	587
Polk.....	.6	4,272
Price.....	.4	2,922
Rusk.....	.4	3,063
St. Croix.....	1.0	7,487
Sawyer.....	.3	2,314
Vilas.....	.1	685
Washburn.....	.2	1,586
Total.....	44.0	314,249

I am told by W. W. Russell, Wisconsin's State conservationist, that the workload of our 72 soil and water conservation districts grows each year. Districts receive more and more requests for soil surveys and other measures of the value of land. Many of these requests now come from land appraisers, planning commissions, credit agencies, and Government.

The districts have increasing responsibilities because of new State and Federal authorizations that provide new opportunities for conservation. They work together, for instance, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566). This law permits local watershed groups to obtain Federal funds for flood prevention and for such conservation activities as improvement of fish and wildlife habitat and development of recreation resources.

River basin planning activities also are becoming more prevalent. Local soil and water conservation districts participate in this important phase of resource development.

The new Resource Conservation and Development (R.C. & D.) program requires assistance from soil conservation districts in working for resource development, cropland conversion, recreation development, and new economic opportunities. One of the first 10 R.C. & D. projects approved as pilot programs is in Wisconsin. The project includes all of Price, Rusk, and Taylor Counties. Technical assistance in planning this regional project was provided by the soil and water conservation specialists working in these three counties.

These greater demands for soil and water conservation assistance at the local level signal the need for more Federal assistance, not less. The soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating farmers need and deserve the full and determined support of both the Congress and the administration.

The supervisors of Wisconsin's 72 districts recently met in Eau Claire to discuss the proposed cuts in support for soil and water conservation. One of the major points made was that the State's work in this field is hardly one-third complete.

I also submit the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors:

"RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, EAU CLAIRE, WIS., MARCH 10, 1965

"All the people of Wisconsin, as well as throughout the Nation, are dependent upon soil and water. We do not have an abundant supply of these natural resources. They can be wasted and lost if not given careful and proper care.

"Seventy-two soil and water conservation districts cover the entire State of Wisconsin. These soil and water conservation districts organized under State enabling legislation provide for the conservation of the soil and soil resources of this State, for the control and prevention of soil erosion, prevention of floodwater and sediment damage, preserve wildlife, protect the tax base, protect public lands and protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of our State.

"Each of these 72 soil and water conservation districts have a memorandum of understanding with the Soil Conservation Service to help carry out the technical phases essential to our program.

"The soil and water conservation work in Wisconsin has made a good start but the job is hardly one-third complete. Pressures are increasing upon our land and water resources. Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Association of Soil and Water Conservation District supervisors oppose the President's revolving fund proposal for the Soil Conservation Service; be it further

"Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Association of Soil and Water Conservation District supervisors urge the continuation of the program as it is now being carried out, and we urge the adoption of the Soil Conservation Service budget for 1966 as recommended by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts."

I suggest that there is nothing in 1965 that makes soil and water conservation less essential than it was in the 1930's. In many ways, as we attempt to shift our less productive farmland into recreational uses, it is more important. This less productive land often is hilly, subject to erosion, and difficult to establish a cover crop on.

I have found from my experiences in Wisconsin that district supervisors and cooperating farmers have a strong feeling of stewardship regarding the land. I think that over the past 25 years there has developed a growing feeling of responsibility toward the soil and the beauty of the countryside.

I also submit a letter that is typical of many that I have received in the past few weeks. This one is from a district supervisor who also is an educator in Buffalo County. It is from O. J. Sohrweide, superintendent of schools at Alma, Wis., and secretary of the Buffalo County Soil and Water Conservation District:

FEBRUARY 18, 1965.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: According to information received from several sources, it appears as though the work being carried on throughout the country by our soil and water conservation districts is due for a drastic setback.

For the past 24 years Buffalo County has

had a soil and water conservation district. In fact our district was started in 1939 and 1940.

During the past 25 years we in Buffalo County have been able to get approximately two-thirds of the farmers in the county to become cooperators in our soil and water conservation program. This progress was made only because of the active interest shown by our Federal Government by providing trained personnel with which to do the job, as well as Federal funds under ACP.

If the Federal budget cutback is allowed to take place we are confident that there will be a slowing up of our program. In other words, it has taken 25 years to get two-thirds of the job done and it might take another 25 years to get the remainder of our country's land and water under a planned and controlled program. We feel that these natural resources do not belong to the farmer alone, but all people in all walks of life are being affected now and will be affected more so in the future. With our population increase we feel that every acre of our precious topsoil, every drop of our available water supply will be necessary for the growth and development of our Nation.

Those of us who are close to the soil and water problems of our county and State will appreciate anything you can do to help provide the Federal funds necessary for the continuation of local, State, and Federal soil and water conservation district programs.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. SOHRWEIDE.

If this proposal is approved by the Congress, I think it is probable that county boards will be asked to make up Wisconsin's \$314,249 share of the contribution to the revolving fund for this technical assistance. The only other alternative would seem to be to have the districts seek contributions from the farmer to make up this lost Federal support.

This does not seem to be a fair choice. Local and State government in Wisconsin and elsewhere already make a sizable contribution to the support of the work of these soil and water conservation districts.

Several counties furnish secretarial assistance to the districts. The supervisors, who throughout Wisconsin are members of the agriculture committee of each county board, serve the districts without pay. Many counties furnish office space, the use of office equipment, and other services to the Soil Conservation Service.

The reason the funds probably would have to be raised by the county boards is that charging farmers and landowners for a share of these technical services is administratively unworkable. Who is going to set the charge for these services? What do we want the Government to charge a farmer when a soil technician stops in his farmyard to give him some advice on planting some shrubs to improve wildlife habitat or on stopping erosion in a troublesome gully? Will this new rate-making job fall to the unpaid soil and water conservation district supervisors? I'm sure they hope not.

Who will do the bookkeeping and fill out the forms for the Department of Agriculture and collect for these services? Will this new responsibility fall on the volunteer office-worker furnished by the county board?

Suppose the county boards decide they are too hard pressed for funds after paying for this technical assistance and decide to charge the Department of Agriculture for the use of courthouse space? Will Congress be asked to appropriate some funds for this?

I think it is clear that this proposed cutback is shortsighted and in fact militates against the very conservation program the President has undertaken with such vigor. Furthermore, it will undermine one of the